



PAETEC

March 19, 2007

Marlene H. Dortch, Esq.
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554

Re: WC Docket 01-92, Developing a Unified Intercarrier Compensation Regime

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On March 19, 2007, the undersigned and J.T. Ambrosi, Vice President, Carrier and Government Relations for PAETEC Communications, Inc., met by teleconference with Al Lewis, Jennifer McKee, and Victoria Goldberg of the Wireline Competition Bureau, Pricing Policy Division. We discussed the adverse impact on CLECs of the changes to 47 CFR § 20.11 made by the Commission's *T-Mobile* Declaratory Ruling in the above proceeding, released February 24, 2005. We pointed out that those rule changes appear to prohibit *all* local exchange carriers from imposing compensation obligations on CMRS providers pursuant to tariffs, while granting only to *incumbent* LECs the ability to compel negotiations and arbitrations of interconnection agreements with CMRS providers. We explained that this left CLECs like PAETEC in the worst of both worlds, without any apparent legal or policy justification. We discussed what might have caused both the Commission and the industry to overlook this adverse impact at the time. We pointed out, however, that PAETEC has recently had difficulty negotiating a satisfactory interconnection agreement with a large CMRS provider, and that PAETEC has experienced the same frustration and lack of bargaining power that the Commission was attempting to remedy for small ILECs when it granted them an explicit right to compel CMRS providers to arbitrate. We discussed why and how this inequity should be promptly redressed.

Respectfully submitted,

John B. Messenger
Vice President & Associate General Counsel
PAETEC Communications, Inc.

cc: Al Lewis, Jennifer McKee, Victoria Goldberg